

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,693	09/30/2003	Sherman Lee	50915/SDB/B600	5114
23363	7590 04/18/2006		EXAM	INER
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP PO BOX 7068			NGUYEN, LEE	
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ĺ			2618	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/674,693	LEE ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
	<u> </u>	LEE NGUYEN	2618
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v tre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a repivill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cause the application to become ARA	ATION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication.
Status	(4)		
	Poppopolito to communication(s) find an OF (
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 Ja</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This	anuary 2006. action is non-final.	
3)□	,		
<u>ا ا</u> رد	Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E		
		x parte Quayle, 1955 C.D.	11, 455 O.G. 215.
isposit	ion of Claims		
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,14,15,17-21 and 28-41 is/are 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,14,15 and 17-21 is/are allowe Claim(s) 28-41 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration. d.	
pplicat	ion Papers		
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b)⊡ objected to by	the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.
riority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) 🗌 a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Apprity documents have been re u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage
Attachmen	et(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

This action is responsive to the communication filed on 01/25/2006.

Claims 3, 9-13, 16, 22-27 were canceled. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 14-15, 17-21, 28-41 remain in prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 28-32, 34-39, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banu et al. (US 5,757,872) in view of Roy et al. (US 6,266,385).

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claims 28, 35, Banu teaches a receiver system and method 106 (fig. 1) comprising:

a receiver 106 adapted to receive a signal 107, generated in accordance with a transmit clock signal 208 (fig. 2), to provide a data signal 204, 212 (fig. 2); a first-in first-out memory 210 coupled to the receiver to receive and store the data signal; and a processing circuit (not show, col. 5, lines 1-12) coupled to the first-in first-out memory 210 to retrieve the stored data signal in accordance with a read signal 110 (figs. 1-2). Banu fails to teach the read signal is not synchronized to a clock signal derived from the transmit clock signal. Roy teaches a processing circuit 390 coupled to a FIFO memory 300 (fig. 4) to generate a read signal that is not synchronized to a clock signal derived from the transmit clock signal (col. 5, lines 46-65 and col. 7, lines 40-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Roy with Banu in order to transfer data with reliability.

Regarding claims 29, 36, the combination of Banu and Roy also teaches that the receiver recovers a clock signal 208 from received signal 204 (Banu, fig. 2, col. 2, lines 27-34) and that the read signal is not synchronized to the recovered clock signal (Roy, col. 6, lines 26-31 and col. 5, lines 55-62).

Regarding claims 30-31, 38-39, the combination of Banu and Roy also teaches that the

processing circuit comprises a data processor or a host computer (Banu, col. 5, lines 1-15).

Page 4

Regarding claims 32, 37, the combination of Banu and Roy inherently teaches that the processing circuit is adapted to perform at least one of baseband processing, link management functions and protocol stack functions (see data stream 110 of Banu in figures 1-2).

Regarding claims 34, 41, the combination of Banu and Roy also teaches that the first-in first-out memory is sized in accordance with a variation between a rate at which first-in first-out memory is written and a rate at which the first-in first-out memory is read (Roy, col. 6, line 56 – col. 7, line 23)...

Claims 33, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banu in view of Roy as applied to claims 28, 35 above, and further in view of Alston (US 6,055,285).

Regarding claims 33, 40, the above combination fails to teach that processing circuit reads the data signal from the first-in

first-out memory in bursts. Alston teaches that the processor reads the data from the FIFO memory in bursts (col. 6, lines 17-33). It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2618

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Alston to the receiver of the above combination in order to enhance data transfer mode to the receiver.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 14-15, 17-21 are allowed.

Claims 1 and 14 are allowed according to the incorporation of claims 3 and 16, respectively.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 28-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7854. The examiner can normally be reached on FIRST FRIDAY OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ANDERSON D. MATTHEW can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/674,693

Art Unit: 2618

693 Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LEE NGUYEN)